



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

(Continued from page 132.)

Before I proceed further, I must say a word upon a subject which no words can ever give an adequate idea of to those who had not the misfortune to be themselves witnesses of it—I mean the famine caused by the mysterious potato blight of 1847. At least one-half of my parishioners fell victims to it, either in their own cabins or in those abattoirs or slaughter-houses of human beings, the temporary workhouses, from which they were carted out into the churchyards, to make room for others who were to succeed them. At no period of Ireland's history had the ministers of religion more arduous and melancholy duties to discharge, with less means to alleviate the distress, of which they were the hourly witnesses. The priests were living next door to pauperism, and the clergy of the Established Church, most of whom had families to support, were impoverished by a double poor-rate unjustly charged upon their rent-charge, and scarcely better able to relieve them. I shall not stop to criticise the abortive though, doubtless, well-meant efforts of the government, to give useless employment through the Board of Works, in making skeleton roads and destroying good ones, nor to lament that the large views of that eminent man, Lord George Bentinck, to construct railroads at the public expense, were not adopted instead. In spite of every effort, practical or speculative, many poor families died off day after day, and after full one-half of them had passed into an untimely grave, I felt it my duty to advise the others to depart to the New World, whilst a remnant of property remained in their hands; and according to the accounts since received, the greater part of them now form an independent and respectable colony on the banks of the Missouri. I at the same time resigned my living into the hands of the bishop, and betook myself to reading as the only resource now left to me. The results to which this reading led me I shall now endeavour briefly to communicate, not indeed in the order in which my own mind arrived at them, which it would be difficult for me now to retrace or analyse, nor in that fullness in which they were by degrees brought out in my mind, into a clearer light, which would occupy much greater space than would be reasonable to expect at your hands, but I hope with sufficient distinctness to lead, and, perhaps, assist others to examine and reflect for themselves whether they are following truth or error in adhering to the system taught by the Church of Rome.

It was a gloomy and tempestuous evening that I took down from the bookcase a volume of Johnson's works; and, in the course of the night, met the following observation—"that, at fifty, a person should be in earnest about his religion." As I was myself approaching this age, the observation struck me with the greater force, and I awoke at once to a dreadful perception of my own danger in having thought so little of my personal state; and I determined upon a decided and impartial examination of my state of mind and, among other things, of the truth of the doctrines of the Church to which I belonged. I at once placed the catechism and the Maynooth class-book on one hand, and the Bible on the other—the great charter of man's salvation—and, having invoked the Spirit of Truth to enlighten my understanding and to dispel prejudice, I set to work according to the advice of St. Paul, 2nd of the Corinthians, chapter the 13th, and 5th verse—"Examine yourselves, whether you be in the faith. Prove your own selves." As I was resolved to examine every point *seriatim* and impartially, I began at the beginning, by inquiring if, as the catechism teaches, "the Church of Rome was the first Church, the matron and mistress of all other Churches," and whether the Church of Rome was founded by St. Peter.

On consulting the New Testament, which I exchanged in Paris for that veritable book called the Breviary, I found that the Churches of Corinth, of Thessalonica, of Ephesus, of Antioch, of Philippi, together with the Churches of Galatia, were in existence, and had bishops and deacons, before there was a Church in Rome; and, consequently, the Church of Rome was *not* the first Church, the matron and the mistress of all other Churches.

Besides, is it not more in accordance with the nature of things that the first Churches should radiate round the theatre of the crucifixion than that an Apostle should start "*tout a coup*" to establish a Church in the most heathen city in Europe. Moreover, the Apostles took advantage of the miracles performed by Christ, before and after his death, to establish the first Churches in the adjacent provinces whilst the recollection of these miracles was still fresh in their memories.

St. Peter, so far from having founded the Church of Rome, probably never saw the Eternal City. St. Paul in his epistle to the Colossians, which was written from Rome (chap. iv.), mentions the names of his fellow-labourers in the vineyard of the Lord—Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, and Justus—and if St. Peter was then at Rome, surely he would not have omitted making mention of his name. St. Paul also says that no person stood by him at his first defence, which could not be if St. Peter was in Rome.

We read in the first chapter of St. Paul to the Galatians, eighteenth verse, that St. Paul abode in Jerusalem with Peter for fifteen days, and that he again met him, in the same place, after an interval of fourteen years. St. Paul salutes many persons in Rome, but does not

mention St. Peter. There is, besides, one other position which must appear evident to the most sceptic, and superior to all argumentative opposition to establish that St. Peter was not at Rome. It is that the Emperor Claudius banished all Jews from Rome, and, consequently, St. Peter, if there, must have been amongst the number; but it is evident he was not, as St. Peter would sooner make mention of his name than of Aquila, whom he came to see from Athens to Corinth.

Moreover, St. Peter was an Apostle, and could not remain stationary in any one place, as Christ said to his Apostles (St. Mark xvi. 15)—"And he said unto them, Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature."

But, for the sake of argument, let me suppose that St. St. Peter established the Church of Rome. What security, in point of doctrine, would that confer on the Church of Rome? I say none; as it is admitted by Protestants, as well as by Romanists, that the Church of Antioch was founded by St. Peter, yet that the Church of Antioch fell, not merely in matters of discipline, but into errors of the most vital importance in point of doctrine. From what has been said, and proved by the infallible authority of the Word of God, I found that the Church of Rome was not the first Church, the matron and mistress of all other Churches; and although the proofs that the Scripture affords to establish that St. Peter was not the founder of the Roman Church are negative, still these proofs are equivalent to positive proofs, when the contrary is not supported by positive and direct evidence.

The next question I had to inquire into was, what was the creed the first Churches professed? I found the Apostolic creed to be the first and only creed of the primitive Catholic Church for 300 years after the death of our Redeemer. In the year 325, I found that the Council of Nice augmented the Apostle's creed, and made it more explanatory, and, of course, more easy of comprehension, by its interpretation. The acts of this council were confirmed by the Council of Constantinople, held in the year 351. The Council of Ephesus, held in 431, approved and confirmed the decrees of Nice and Constantinople; and, to crown all, I find that the Council of Chalcedon had sanctioned the proceedings of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus, in the year 451. *L'écriture et les symboles sont les témoignages des premiers chrétiens et de L'Eglise qu'ils forment.* The nearer we approach the times of the Apostles and their successors, the purer must the doctrine be; just as the nearer we come to the head of a fountain the more limpid the water. Notwithstanding the anathema pronounced by the Council of Ephesus against those who shall dare to alter, add, or take from this creed, yet we find Pope Pius IV. adding twelve new articles to the ancient creed, in the year 1564, and six commandments, which are explained more frequently by the priests, and considered of even more importance, than the commandments of God.

Every question which involves the momentous interest of man's salvation should be investigated with all the energy of the heart and soul; but, at the same time, with that calm and deliberate attention which a subject of such importance eminently deserves. The Mass is a grave subject, and of paramount and everlasting practical importance to the salvation of man, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and deserves, therefore, to be inquired into with grave consideration. Let us, then, follow the advice of the Prophet Isaiah, c. 1, v. 18—"Come now and let us reason together." The doctrine of the Church of Rome is—that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, and that the sacrifice of the Mass is the same as the sacrifice of the Last Supper; and that in the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion is called Transubstantiation—Trent, Session 13.

There are here three important questions to be examined. The first is, Is the Mass a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead? The second is, Was the Lord's Supper a sacrifice? And the third is, Are the bread and wine converted, by the sacerdotal action, into the body and blood of Christ? Let us examine each of these questions *seriatim*, and with that cool and deliberate attention which they deserve, as they are of cardinal importance to man's salvation, according to the doctrine of Trent. As these questions are bare allegations of the Council of Trent, unsupported by a single scintilla of proof, the burthen of proving them rests on the Church which asserts them, and not on its opponents to disprove them. But I will here state some reasons, taken from Scripture, which afford proof that the Mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice. We read in Leviticus, c. xvii., v. 11, "For it is blood that makes atonement for the soul." This doctrine of the Old Scripture is confirmed by that of St. Paul (Hebrews, ix. 22), "And without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin." We find also, in the same epistle, c. vii., v. 27, "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, for this he did once." Again, we read in the same epistle, c. 10, v. 12, "But this man, after he offered *one* sacrifice for sin, for ever sat down on the right hand of God." Therefore, as

our Saviour offered but *one* sacrifice, that was the sacrifice of Calvary, it follows that there is no propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass, nor the smallest necessity for it, as the atonement of the cross was all-sufficient, and the most august that was ever offered to an offended deity. Besides, the Apostle speaks in this entire chapter in the singular number, which he would not have done if the future Mass was to be propitiatory, and ancillary to the sacrifice of the cross.

The next question is, Was there a sacrifice at the Last Supper? I answer, most certainly not. The above proofs are equally applicable to the Lord's Supper, and prove that it was not a sacrifice. Moreover, there was no sacrificial act performed, there was no altar, no victim offered, no blood spilled. Christ was simply at table, surrounded by his disciples, to whom he gave bread and wine, as a lasting memorial of his love for them, and, therefore, there was no propitiatory sacrifice at the Last Supper.

The third question to be examined is, Are the elements of bread and wine changed by the sacerdotal agency into the body and blood of Christ? To which I answer, hear the proofs from Holy Writ, and judge for yourself. We read in the xxiii. chap., 19th and 20th verses of St. Luke—"And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying—This is my body which is given for you. This do in remembrance of me. Likewise, also, the cup, after supper, saying—This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you." The Church of Rome, on the authority of the bishops of Trent, maintains that the word "*is*," in the 19th verse, should be taken literally, and that Christ actually converted the bread and wine into his own body and blood, and gave them to his Apostles.

In innumerable passages of the Old and New Scripture, the monosyllable "*is*," is taken to mean "*represents*." In the 17th chap. and 10th verse of Genesis, where God was speaking of the circumcision, says—"This is my covenant." It must appear evident to every person that the circumcision was not transubstantiated into the covenant, but that it must be taken in a figurative sense, and only as a memorial of the covenant. In the 12th chap. of Exodus we read, when God was speaking of the lamb that was sacrificed in memory of the passing over the houses of the Israelites and smiting the first-born amongst the Egyptians—"It is the Lord's passover." Here also the word "*is*" must be taken as represent, as the lamb could not be transubstantiated into the passover. I could multiply proofs from the Old Scripture where that monosyllable "*is*" must be taken to mean represent. But as proofs from the New Scripture seem to have more weight with most people, let us come to it, and see if it is so in that also. In the 13th chap. of St. Matthew, v. 37, our Saviour says—"He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man." In verse 38 of the same chapter, he says—"The field is the world." And in the 39th verse, same chapter—"The harvest is the end of the world." And St. Paul, speaking of the Church, says—"It is the body of Christ." Now, as the monosyllable, *is*, must be taken figuratively to have any meaning in all those passages, it follows, as analogous, that "*is*" must be taken in a figurative sense, and to mean represent, in the 22nd chap. 19th verse of St. Luke, where we read—"This is my body." Besides, was it not thus the institution of the Lord's Supper was taken in the early ages, when the religion of Christ was inculcated in its sublime simplicity, and before the doctrine of Transubstantiation was propounded by Paschasius-Radbert—an abbot of the ninth century.

There is another argument taken from the nature of things which places this question beyond the reach of argument and scepticism, and is, I believe, *de la première main*, to which I take leave to call the reader's attention. The properties of all created things are either contingent or essential; the contingent properties—such as colour, shape, or particular configuration—cannot subsist by themselves without a subject of adhesion; but the essential and vital properties are necessarily constituent, and without which no subject can subsist; whereas the contingent properties do not of necessity appertain to any object. Thus, a circle must be equidistant from its centre, as rotundity is the essential property of a circle; but that circle may be large or small, as these are accidental properties. A man cannot exist without lungs, blood-vessels, muscle, and tendons; but he can be black or white, short or tall, as these are only contingent properties. The essential properties of things are truths existing from eternity, and are founded in the nature of things, and are immutable and intransitive. That it is in the power of man to change the accidental properties of things cannot be denied; but no known agency can either commute or annihilate the essential and constituent attributes of things. There was no antecedent time, nor will there be a future time, when it *was* or *will* be true that things could exist without their essential and distinctive properties. Buffon, in his theory of the earth, when speaking upon this subject, says (page 384, vol. ii.)—"Aucun agent connu ne sera jamais capable de faire sortir les propriétés du cercle de combinaisons propres à leur nature." I am not here to be understood as limiting the power of him who does all things well, as God could annihilate all things with their essential and accidental properties; but, as soon as anything is created, it must of necessity possess its vital and essential attributes, because it is founded in the nature of things.

Bread and wine must have their essential and elemen-

tary properties in common with all created things, and must retain their immutable and intransitive character, independent of any external agency. Besides this metaphysical argument, we find the same substantial identity after the sacerdotal action as before. We have a metaphysical certainty arising from the nature of things, that no subject can exist without its peculiar and distinctive properties. The evidence of our senses establishes the same identity after the ministerial agency; and, to crown all, the omniscience of God confirms both, as He knew that the nature of created things could not be altered; and, consequently, he must have spoken figuratively. What weight can the Council of Trent have when placed in juxtaposition with the above proofs? Yet, in her 13th session, she pronounces an entire conversion of the elementary properties of bread and wine.

Perhaps it will be objected to me that He who created the heavens and the earth—the fixed stars with their concomitant planets, all things visible and invisible, who changed the rod of Moses into a serpent, who changed Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, who changed the river of Egypt into blood, and the water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana—could change the elementary properties of bread and wine into his own body and blood, by a miraculous interposition. To this I answer, that a miracle is a suspension of the natural law to promote a moral advantage. All these miraculous changes were intuitively, and by immediate perception, *apparent to the senses of every person present*, and reason bowed in affirmation to their decision. But, in the case of Transubstantiation, there must be not only a suspension of the natural law but an entire subversion of the fundamental principles of physics—an entire prostration of the senses, with marks of no confidence stamped upon their creation. But in order to have a parallel case with Transubstantiation, the wine, at the wedding feast, should still have retained, after its conversion, the colour and taste of water, together with all its pure and elementary properties, instead of satisfying, as it did, the combined energies of the senses of all who witnessed it, that a real change had taken place, from actual water into actual wine, with all the qualities of taste, colour, and smell naturally incident to it.

From these proofs, taken from the sacred Scripture, it must appear evident that there was but *one* propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of mankind, and that was the sacrifice of Calvary. That there was no sacrifice at the last supper appears from the same proofs, and that no change has, or could be effected by the sacerdotal action, so as to transubstantiate a particle of dough into the God of the universe.

How melancholy, then, is the reflection, that so many, who profess the religion of Rome, run on from the cradle to the tomb without inquiring if they are following the religion of Christ and him crucified, or without ever opening the Bible—the great charter of man's salvation, which, in every page, points out the way to eternal life. How true to life was that remark of Addison, which says—"If you tell the same story to a man for several years consecutively he will believe it to be true in the end." This observation is confirmed by the conduct of the followers of Rome, who hear their priests say, every week, that the mass is a continuation of the sacrifice of the cross, and that the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ, without ever inquiring into the truth of this doctrine, which is entirely refuted by the teaching of the New Scripture.

If we compare the worship of Roman Catholics of the present day, though to them the light of revelation has been made known, even with the simple, yet sublime, homage of the uneducated Indians of Peru, what a melancholy contrast! They worshipped the sun—the parent of life and vegetation, of time and seasons, of all things visible, yet unapproachable. What more solid foundation to build *natural* religion upon? A perpetual fire burned on the altar of the Indians. What a beautiful representation of their divinity! This sun worship seems to have been widely spread, and was known to the Phenicians, Chaldeans, Babylonians, and even to the Irish people in their natural state. A fractional remnant of this untaught religion may even still be seen in this island, when fires are lit when the sun is at its highest altitude at the summer solstice. Possibly this adoration of the Indian was only secondary, but at any rate it was the sublime poetry—the dignified and refined religion—of nature's uneducated children. Place this pure, sublime, and æthereal homage of uneducated Pagans in contrast with that of modern Roman Catholics, and how great is the difference? The former adored the parent of life, the latter a particle of dough. As rational and accountable beings, I shudder for the consequences. Idolatry though unconscious is still idolatry. If Transubstantiation be an error, as I have demonstrated it to be, what must be the guilt of those in the sight of God, who, in spite of both their reason and their senses, persist in practising a mimic and idolatrous adoration.

(To be Continued.)

#### TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXVI.

"Them's hard times, Jem," said Pat.  
 "That's true anyway, Pat," said Jem; "it's not easy keeping the meal to the children these times. But sure we have a right to be thankful it's no worse."  
 "Well, Jem," said Pat, "I heard Mr. Nulty talking

of that, and he allowed that if the crops was short this year, it's the famine we would have back again; so we have a right to be thankful sure enough."

"And it's the poor thing, too, that the Rooshians with their fighting, should stint the childer of the meal," said Jem; "I wonder will it soon be over."

"Well, I heard Mr. Nulty allow it wouldn't," said Pat; "and he allowed there would be mighty heavy taxes on the farmers and the gentlemen to pay for it; so you see all gets their pinch by it as well as we."

"Well, it's not bad times yet with the farmers," said Jem; "they're pretty snug for a while anyway. But I suppose they will get their turn of the pinch too."

"Well, most all comes in for it by turns," said Pat; "but there's some getting the pinch sore enough these years back, that there isn't much said of."

"And who would that be?" said Jem.  
 "Why it's the priests, Jem," said Pat; "sure it's they got the pinch in earnest in the famine times, and hasn't come round yet like the farmers."

"Well," said Jem, "I don't think times is hard on Father John, and sure there's Father Peter, the curate, and Father Brady of the next parish, and enough more of them, that keeps their hunters as fine as ever."

"Well, there's some of them not much the worse," said Pat; "but even Father John hasn't near what he had; and there's a deal of the priests that got it sore in the famine times, and that isn't much better yet; you see, Jem, where the farms is good, and the farmers strong, the priest gets his share now as well as ever; but where the priests were depending to the little man, it went to the bad with them entirely. Sure the poor people can't pay them now the way they used; and there isn't the marrying and the christening there used to be; and there's a deal of places where the poor people itself isn't in it; and what can the priest do there? and where there's large Protestant grazing farms, and the poor people's houses down, sure the priest may go starve."

"Well, it's the poor thing, sure enough," said Jem, "for them that was bred to be clargy, and had such a rule in the country, to come to that. Sure they can't do without it no more nor ourselves, and they're not used to it; and it doesn't come natural to clargy, the way it does to the like of us. Sure I would be sorry for Father John himself, if he was at a dis-short; but it makes again them greatly when some of them keeps their hunters, and goes a skevying across the country after the hounds; 'deed I thought many a time it would be no worse for them if they would take after the Protestant clergy in that. But what becomes of them at all where they gets nothing?"

"Well, I heard a deal about that, when I was down at the fairs in Connaught," said Pat. "I was talking to the men that driv up the cattle from the out-of-the-way places, and they allowed there wasn't half the priests in it there used to be; and them that was there had little enough to live on; and maybe it's getting less was the little."

"And where are the priests that's not in it?" said Jem.  
 "Why, there's some in America, and some in Australia," said Pat.

"Well, sure if they follow the people, won't they do as well as ever?" said Jem.

"They won't, Jem," said Pat; "by all accounts the people isn't the same in America as they is here. Don't you mind Father Mullen's letter that we read in the newspaper\* that made it out that two millions of the Irish had turned in America. Sure it isn't them the priests can live by. You see, Jem, America is a kind of place where every man does what he likes."

"Well, I wonder why people doesn't do what they like in Ireland, as well as in America," said Jem; "but, sure enough, they don't; what's the reason at all?"

"Well, I had a talk about that, with a man that drove up the sheep that Mr. Nulty bought at Ballinasloe," said Pat; "he was a mighty cute sensible man; and we fell into talk, and I asked him that very same; and says he, 'do you mind them sheep,' says he; 'now, while you keep them together on the road, where the one goes, they'll all go,' says he, 'and you'll just have no trouble at all; but, if you won't let them get one in one field, and another in another field, why, then, every sheep goes after its own nose, and no two goes the same way; and its the more they'll scatter,' says he, 'and the harder on you to gather them; and that's the way with men, too,' says he; 'keep them together, and they'll go the one way; but, once they scatter, then every man goes the way he likes, and no man thinks no more about what every body does; so you mind the sheep and keep them all together,' says he."

"And will the Irish people go the one way for ever in Ireland, without minding the way they would like to go?" said Jem.

"Why, man alive," said Pat, "don't you see yourself, if a bully of a sheep just makes a bolt at the hedge, all the rest goes bolt after him too; and sure it's in the field they will be in spite of you. Sure it's in the field they would all like to be; and, when the bully goes, won't they be after him?"

"Aye," said Jem, "I see that surely; but where will we get the right sort of bully in Ireland? Sure it's sheep we are, but there isn't the bullies in it."

So Pat looked Jem right hard in the face, as if he was going to be the bully to make the bolt himself—only he wasn't. So said Pat, looking as hard as he could, "Jem, it's a right bully of a priest I would like to see, of the right sort; and wouldn't he have the following?"

"And what would you have him to do, at all?" said Jem.

So Pat looked harder at Jem than ever; and he said, with a fire that seemed to be dancing in his eye, "Jem, as I'm a living man, there's a something afore us in Ireland; and a priest, with THE BIBLE in his hand, is what Ireland wants."

"And would you have him to turn, and have the bishop on his back?" said Jem.

"I don't want him to turn neither backward nor forward," said Pat, "but to hold up the Douay Bible in his hand, and to call on the Irish people; that's the man that Ireland's waiting for, and that's the man for the following; and it isn't the bishop on his back he need think about, for it's Ireland he will have at his back."

"And would he be a Protestant all out, Pat?" said Jem.

"Well, that isn't so easy seen, Jem," said Pat. "You see, if a man quits the Mass, and goes to Church, he changes his name plain enough; but, if a priest only stands up in the chapel, and holds up a Douay Bible in his hand, and says, 'Boys, it's the Word of God that is able to save our souls,' it isn't so easy seen if that makes them all Protestants. Anyway, it's not as plain as a man walking, by himself alone, out of the chapel into the church."

"Aye, but where would that stop, Pat?" said Jem.

"It wouldn't stop short of the Word of God, Jem," said Pat; "and why should it; and who could say again it. Who could stop it, at all? Neither crook nor crozier, if that bolt was made by the right bully. Wouldn't all Ireland turn round to the priest with the Bible in his hand?"

"And will the like of that ever be, Pat?" said Jem.

"Jem," said Pat, "there has been trouble from God in Ireland. His hand done it. There was trouble on the people, and trouble on the priest. And it's not for nothing. The hearts of the people is stirred, like what they never was before; and there seems to be something that the hearts of the people wants; and it can't be nothing but the Word that comes from God. There's a something afore us; and it's THE MAN we're waiting on."

Time will tell if Pat has rightly comprehended the feeling of poor men like himself. And, perhaps, "the man," when he comes, may look back to the words of Pat.

#### THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.

##### No. IV.

WE have been obliged by press of other matter, so long to postpone the following paper, that it may be necessary to remind our readers, that we have already shown in former numbers,\* that so far from the celibacy of the clergy having always prevailed in Ireland, for many centuries of our history, ecclesiastical benefices descended in this Island of Saints from one member of a family to another (often from father to son or grandson), much in the same way, as did secular landed property, according to the old Irish law or custom, known by the name of *Tanistry*.

We showed, that from A.D. 753 to A.D. 1134, the same custom prevailed through 12 generations at Clonmacnoise, that it also prevailed for a period of 300 years in the churches of Lusk, Monasterboice, Iona, Derry, Kildara, Armagh, and many others.

We concluded our last paper, by noticing the strange contrast between the accounts given of the death of Murrough, A.D. 1134, by the Irish Annalists, the Four Masters, and St. Bernard, in his life of Malachy.

According to the former, "Murrough, successor of St. Patrick, died penitent—yea, triumphant." According to the latter, "Murrough—no bishop but a tyrant, an ecclesiastical adulterer, went from this world to be damned; yet still, to live in an heir, provided for the purpose of adding to his deeds of damnation!"

The quiet remark of the very learned Father Colgan, on this curious difference between St. Bernard and the Irish Annalists, is to the following effect:—"St. Bernard," says he, (speaking of Primate Niall), "is more severe on this individual than are our native Annals;" which Dr. O'Donovan quotes in his "Annals of the Four Masters" (A.D. 1139, p. 1062, note b.) as "a very appropriate remark." We do not however, think it so. It would not appear to us at all an appropriate remark to say, "Dr. MacFale is more severe on the Achill Scripture-readers than the Protestant clergy are." It would rather seem a stupid remark, and likely to have come from some one who did not understand the matter, or know how to represent it fairly; because the Protestant clergy are not at all severe on the readers, but countenance and favour them. So neither are the Irish Annalists anywhere, or in anyway, severe on Primate Niall or his family, any more than on their opponent Maelmogue and his helpers. On the contrary, they speak of them as they do of all the good and pious men whom they notice generally, and mention their deaths as those of any

\* We gave extracts from this letter in our number for September, 1852, vol. i., p. 103.

\* See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii. pp. 51, 87; vol. iii., pp. 33, 48.